DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 890 HE 012 510

AUTHOR Mayville, William V.
TITLE Changing Perspectives on the Urban College and University. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, April 1980.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 5p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($.40)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; College Students; Community Colleges; *Community Development; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational History; Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; *Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Institutional Role; Professional Associations; Public Policy; *School Community Relationship; *Social Responsibility; Student Role; Teacher Role; Urban Areas; Urban Improvement; Urban Studies; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

The evolving relationship between cities and urban colleges and universities is traced historically, and the implications of changing roles of the university are considered. The public service role of American higher education institutions has increased for both private and public schools. Attention is directed to the role of faculty, administration, and institutions in relation to the urban educational environment and its changing college student clientele. One development is accommodation to the world of work in the college curriculum. Reluctance of many faculty to engage in this new tendency has set some institutions apart from their urban context, yet, some other institutions have thrived on community service as a major part of institutional mission and development. Changes in the program structure of institutions seem mandatory to serve the diverse dimensions of urban life. The federal commitment to urban institutions is indicated by the Education Amendments of 1980, which altered Title XI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to read "The Urban Grant University Program." Many professional organizations also assist urban universities and their constituents. Reasons for the community college's ability to act effectively and efficiently in the area of community development are cited, and some model urban programs at community colleges are noted. Support for urban universities was expressed in the "Memorandum of Understanding" (1980), which was generated by several postsecondary education associations in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (SW)

ED185890

RESEARCH CURRENTS

April 1980

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education

CHANGING PERSPECTIVES ON THE URBAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

By William V. Mayville

Historically, urban universities predate the modern university by some eight centuries and were originally designed to provide an education generally independent of dovetailing education to meet social needs. The relation of the city to the university has fluctuated between mutual accord and overt hostility to ambiguity over roles to the present striving after city-university connections, so that postsecondary education becomes woven into the socioeconomic fabric of contemporary urban life. This *Research Currents* examines the evolving relationship between cities and urban colleges and universities that has culminated in the Urban Grant University Program, a part of the Education Amendments of 1980. The study focuses on the role of faculty, administration, and institutions in relation to the urban educational environment and its changing student clientele for college and university services.

Changing Missions of Urban Colleges and Universities

Shifting Institutional Perspectives—The earliest colleges began in medieval towns like Paris and Bologna and later in cities like London, Manchester, Berlin, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Milan and Brussels.* The University of Paris can be singled out as an example of an international institutional model, where scholars from all over the Western world assembled to study. But as a concomitant to intellectual vitality and ferment, conflict arose with town authorities, which precipitated the closing in the thirteenth century of Paris University for a period of reappraisal and cooling off.

In Italy, universities became a part of city rivalries in spheres of social prestige, such as commerce, literature, and the arts. Competitions among city universities became so intense that in Bologna any student who attempted to transfer to a rival city institution was subject to the death penalty. Professors were also liable to this fate.

Provincial universities sprang into being as a function of their utility in emergent industrial centers in the late nineteenth and in the twentieth century. The rise of the German universities in cities in the nineteenth century is interpreted by Klotsche (1966, p. 3) to be a product of environmental adaptation. German cities were becoming administrative and technological centers so their universities gave curricular emphasis to administrative and scientific research.

However, Oxford and Cambridge, which were to become the model for the American collegiate development, thrived in rural areas where "the advantage of university dominance of a small town was clearly superior to city dominance of the university" (p. 3). Thus, the urban university in America took shape when "the metropolis [emerged] as a major force in American higher education," but with a significant difference:

> as the state and land-grant universities in the past provided major opportunity for the children of middle income families, so the urban university—especially the publically supported one, can bring to realization the educational aspirations of America's lower income families (Klotsche 1966, p. 7).

New Roles of Urban Institutions—Arnold Grobman, chancellor of the University of Missouri, St. Louis, in an address before the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, drew a distinction between public urban universities of the older variety, such as UCLA and the University of Minnesota, and the newer type, like Portland State University, the University of Massachusetts at Boston, the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, and Cleveland State University. The former, he said, were regional or national in thrust; the latter largely directed to serve the educational needs of a specific metropolitan area. Grobman (1978, p. 2) does observe certain commonalities: both types of urban institutions "are expected to offer quality higher education programs, to contribute to the pool of human knowledge, and to provide responsible services within their special competences."

The dichotomy between the public service, community-oriented institution and other types of urban institutions was stated in an extreme form by the American historian Henry Steele Commanger in 1960:

> the first responsibility of the university is not to serve its immediate community but to serve the much larger community of learning of which it is a part. . . . those urban universities that resolutely act on this principle are also those that command the most ardent and generous support form their communities—London and Paris, let us say, or Harvard and Columbia and Johns Hopkins. The first purpose of the university is not to serve the practical vocational needs of the local community . . . but to serve the needs of society at large and in the realms of basic research. It is reassuring that the universities which act on this principle are those which, in the end, enjoy both affection and prestige (Commanger 1960, p. 88).

By 1966 literature about the social responsibility of higher education institutions began to intensify. Kravitz (1966, p. 24) commented that "the university has the responsibility of making knowledge scholars possess and acquire available to the community so that it may be applied to the improvement of urban life. The traditional function of the university—teaching and research—must now be extended to the application of knowledge to the improvement of society." He went on to say that universities had only just begun to define their responsibilities to the poor (p. 24). Stephen K. Bailey, also writing in 1966, said that "one of the university's main responsibilities is social criticism" (p. 7). He noted that "universities can and must contribute directly to urban decision-making by the discovery of root laws of human behavior and of the conditions under which such laws operate. . . . We in the universities are being asked with embarassing frequency to recommend solutions to baffling community issues. In most cases we lack the humility to confess that we do not know. . . . our research is too often pedestrian, discipline-bound, fragmentary, and nonadditive" (p. 11). However, Bailey made an exception to his plea:

> not all universities in the country have the staff, resources, or inclination to play every role that can be identified. Universities have quite as much right as individuals to be inner-directed. Every institution of higher learning in America has its own discrete style, capacity, and history. That Harvard has not played the same role in metropolitan Boston that Wayne State has played in metropolitan Detroit may be cause for rejoicing rather than for invidious comparisons (p. 12).

As the social turmoil of the 1960's drew to a close the urban university became a center of controversy and change. Old

*The following historical dissertation is based on Klotsche (1966, chapter one).

Research Currents is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either AAHE or the National Institute of Education.

Copies of Research Currents may be ordered for 40¢ each from the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

William V. Mayville is a Research Associate at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

HE 012 510

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ways of thinking and doing had been overturned by new revelations of the potential and actual relevance of institutions of higher learning. One of these revelations centered on the role of urban institutions in providing services to solve social problems in their environment. Funding for urban projects began to increase significantly in the late 1960's and early 1970's. In 1974, the Ford Foundation reflected on its commitment to promoting a closer linkage between American universities and the problems of cities. These problems are generally characterized as "urban blight"—high unemployment among growing populations of poor and more often than not minorities, low educational level of these people, high crime rates, housing shortages, inadequate medical facilities, and lack of social and economic urban planning.

In the 1950's the Ford Foundation had invested $36 million in its effort to encourage the university-city relationship. Pendelton (1974), writing for the Foundation, takes note of the mushrooming of activity in this area: over 300 urban studies centers, proliferation of urban affairs departments, entire schools devoted to preparing students for a wide range of urban occupations. The objectives of the Foundation funding were two: to encourage research on a wide range of urban problems by scholars from a variety of disciplines, and to encourage closer contact between university scholars and city decision-makers so research results could be translated immediately into social action in the urban environment.

Then, in response to the urban racial crises of the 1960's, the Foundation provided about $30 million more to a dozen or so universities to help solve those urgent problems. The largest sum, $10 million went to Columbia, with Harvard, M.I.T., and Chicago next in level of support. Then came Princeton, Berkeley, Northwestern, Johns Hopkins, Miami, Vanderbilt, Yale, Cornell, Rice, and the University of Houston, which received smaller sums.

In retrospect, Pendelton (1974, p. 8) remarked that less was achieved than was hoped for. Among his observations were:

> I am not aware of any startling break-throughs produced in our understanding of how cities operate, what makes them grow or wither, what produces conflict or harmony, and what the keys are to successful government, citizen participation, and efficient delivery of services. . . . we know depressingly little about the dynamics of urban change, nor has research produced many conclusions that are useful to mayors, councilmen, and national urban policy makers. . . . It remains questionable whether any progress has been made toward developing productive working relations between university people and urban leaders (p. 9).

Pendleton (1974) then speculated that "promotions are still highly correlated with applause from one's academic colleagues, and salaries seldom reflect the wisdom of one's advice to the local police chief" (p. 16).

Faculty Role Change—According to Heiss's study, *Challenges to Graduate Schools* (1970), there was a new type of college and university professor beginning to emerge. This "new breed" disavowed the "institutional timidity" with which the academic community traditionally infused its members regarding the scholar's role in social and political matters. Faculty were beginning to take active roles in "designing and reformulating plans for the improvement of the human condition," viewing the university as "an institution without walls," and "eschewing the library as the prime source of information for learning in favor of the 'total environment'" (p. 135). Furthermore, these new faculty tended to be "interdisciplinary persons."

Heiss also noted that there were still faculty who hesitated to adopt aggressive roles, but that they were slowly being replaced by individuals who believed in taking some initiative and in the competitive spirit in the intellectual sphere as well as in the economic. While these faculty seemed radical to many of their colleagues, there was a tacit assumption that "grantsmanship is an acceptable way of life for the scholar in the multiversity" (p. 133).

The Carnegie Commission's 1973 report, *The Campus and The City*, gave credence to the new faculty profile identified by Heiss. The Commission suggested that new urban institutions must be developed with a new type of faculty to explicitly serve the needs of an urban setting (p. 56). To do this they should look for new institutional roles. For example, consideration should be given to:

- The creation of programs designed to provide skilled and professional manpower needed for urban management and development.
- The development of curricula and institutional support activities responsive to the needs of urban students.
- The use of the rich educational resources of the city in their own educational activities, and
- The cooperative use of city agencies and industry to provide effective education and service (p. 23).

In other words, institutional leaders as well as faculty are called on to become entreprenurial and to become students of their own environment.

Changing Student Clientele—An area of much controversy is the extent to which institutions of higher learning should accommodate the learning needs of new clienteles, especially students who are called "disadvantaged." Since many of these students live in cities, what is the responsibility of the urban university to answer their educational needs? The Carnegie Commission recommended that "when institutions serve large numbers of lower-income and part-time working students they must have highly individualized educational programs or a foundation, basic-skills year; they must devote a great portion of their resources to entry-level students; and they must modify their institutional reward structure to provide adequate rewards for commitment and excellence in teaching" (p. 47).

The Commission further recommended that to accommodate the urban student, institutions should offer certain portions of their programs in off-campus facilities, at industrial plants, in business and governmental offices, and at public libraries and schoolrooms in residential areas.

Recent Responses to Urban Needs

The federal commitment to urban institutions was given voice in the Education Amendments of 1980, which altered Title XI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to read "The Urban Grant University Program." This new Title XI was prompted by four observations by Congress: "(1) that there exists within the Nation's urban universities an underutilized reservoir of skills, talents, and knowledge applicable toward the amelioration of the multitude of problems that face the Nation's urban centers; (2) that these skills, talents, and knowledge must be applied in a systematic and sustained manner to impact successfully upon these problems; (3) that the application of these skills, talents, and knowledge is impeded due to the limited funds available to sustain their commitment; and (4) that it is the public policy of the United States to encourage and facilitate the application of these skills, talents, and knowledge toward serving the needs of the Nation's urban centers" ("Education Amendments of 1980," p. 186).

Section 1102 of the Title authorizes an appropriation of $50 million for fiscal year 1981, $70 million for fiscal year 1982, $80 million for fiscal year 1983, $90 million for fiscal year 1984, and $100 million for fiscal year 1985. Multiple-year funding of projects is possible. When grants are made, the Commissioner is to consider evidence of participation of local government agencies in project development and implementation, and commitment to pay a part of the nonfederal share of the cost, which is required by subsection d (no grant shall exceed 90 percent of project cost). It is also recommended that a broad and equitable geographical distribution of funds should be achieved.

The title defines "urban area" as a SMSA (standard metropolitan statistical area) with a population of at least 500,000 people or, in states with no standard SMSA, in an urban area so designated by the Commissioner.

"Urban university" is defined as a higher education institution located in an "urban area," which draws a substantial percentage of its undergraduate population from the area or

from contiguous areas, has programs that make more accessible its postsecondary educational opportunities to area residents, has the capacity to provide the resources necessary to service its area, offers a range of professional and graduate programs adequate to support its capacity to make its resources available to the community, and has shown a commitment by past and present performance to the urban area and its residents ("Education Amendments of 1980," p. 109).

The chief sponsor of the act is the Committee on Urban Program Universities, representing a group of 31 urban institutions. The writing of the legislation is a direct reflection of the characteristics of C U P U 's membership. The current list includes: University of Alabama, Birmingham; California State Universities and Colleges; University of Cincinnati; Cleveland State University; University of the District of Columbia; Georgetown University; Georgia State University; University of Houston; University of Illinois, Chicago Circle; University of Louisville; University of Massachusetts, Boston Harbor; University of Minnesota; University of Missouri, Kansas City; University of Missouri, St. Louis; University of Nebraska, Omaha; New Jersey Institute of Technology; University of New Orleans; Northeastern University; Northeastern Illinois University; Old Dominion University; University of Pittsburgh; University of Rhode Island; Rutgers University; University of South Carolina, Spartenburg; Temple University; Texas Southern University; University of Washington; Wayne State University; and University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

There are other organizations at work to serve urban universities and their constituents. For instance, an Urban College and University Network has been established by the American Association for State Colleges and Universities to provide a communications linkage so that institutions can "build on each other's experience . . . to inform policy makers of problems, of approaches for dealing with these problems, and the support needed to implement workable programs" (*Connections*, April 1979, p. 1). The network includes 280 institutions spread across 38 states. Seventy-five percent of the undergraduate population at these institutions come from the local area; three-quarters said that 50 percent of their students were from the urban poor, ethnic and racial minorities, and the educationally disadvantaged (*Connections*, April 1979, p. 2).

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has an Urban Division that acts to keep members informed of developments in urban education. The division was recently formed in response to the growing need for coordination of member institution programs. Among the common needs that have fostered program support is recruitment and retention of minority students. The University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, City University of New York, Wayne State University, the University of Massachusetts, Boston and the University of Missouri, St. Louis all have responded to this challenge, among others. For example, the University of Missouri, St. Louis has a Center for Academic Development that has units in nondegree mathematics, nondegree credit English, writing lab, reading lab, tutorial program, special services, and academic and peer counseling (*FYI* 1978, p. 3).

Commenting on the perceived dichotomy between public service and scholarship, Calvert Smith, Vice-Provost for Continuing Education and Metropolitan Services at the University of Cincinnati, asserts that "the proponents of these two views have failed to realize that the university that expects to make vital contributions to society and to mankind over the next few decades must be diversified enough in its activities and broad enough in its philosophical perspectives to fulfill both these missions" (*FYI* 1978, p. 4).

In support of this viewpoint, in March of 1980, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the American Council on Education, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development signed a "Memorandum of Understanding" to the effect that all parties will:

> (1) Encourage *and help* member colleges and universities to renew their commitment to the central cities and retain present facilities and, where feasible, to expand in central cities rather than in outlying areas;
> (2) Encourage *and help* member colleges and universities to offer a wide range of educational and cultural programs to central city residents, to respond with innovative education and training programs that meet the needs of low-income and unemployed residents;
> (3) Encourage *and help* member colleges and universities to *conduct research and to provide training and technical assistance* for central city governments and relevant public agencies, to maintain permanent institutional capacity to assist central cities improve their management and planning processes as well as the delivery of public services, to develop partnerships with local government directed at improving local government capacity; and
> (4) Encourage *and help* member colleges and universities to develop innovative affirmative action programs that respond to national commitments to expand minority employment and educational opportunities ("Memorandum . . . January 1980 [draft], p. 2).

Community colleges have from their beginning given the kind of education to which four-year urban colleges and universities have recently turned and which is embodied in the "Memorandum of Understanding" (1980). Recent examples of program types include: New York City Community College's programs for the elderly using television as a primary teaching tool for such courses as Psychology, Critical Analysis of Television, the Middle East, Drama, and Sociology (*Update/Interface*, January/February 1980, p. 1); and Coastline Community College in California and Rio Salado Community College in Phoenix, which are committed to providing community-based, noncampus, lifelong education involving identification of educational markets not being served, finding instructional sites, and using alternative delivery systems like radio, television, and newspaper courses (*Interface* April 1979, p. 1).

Recently, the Center for Community Education of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges identified six colleges to be used as urban demonstrations or model institutions to show the capability of urban colleges working in concert with their communities to focus their resources on urban problems, identified as: social instability in the urban area and the loss of neighborhood influence; unemployment of youth and older residents; and the needs of the elderly poor. The six colleges are Bunker Hill Community College (Charlestown, Massachusetts), Cuyahoga Community College (Cleveland, Ohio), San Francisco Community College District (San Francisco, California), La Guardia Community College (Long Island, New York), and Shelby State Community College District (Seattle, Washington) (AACJC [1980]).

Adaptations at a sample of these colleges include performance objectives and self-paced instruction, and curriculum planning with the assistance of community and institutional advisory committees (San Francisco Community College District); a college population that is composed entirely of work-study students (La Guardia Community College); and an Open College that permits students to receive credit for learning gained outside the college environment as well as a contract learning program, whereby students negotiate their learning experience with a program counselor and a suitable content advisor (Bunker Hill Community College).

To the five dimensions of community college education—lower-division college transfer, vocational education, general adult or continuing education, counseling and guidance, and community service—a sixth dimension has been suggested: community development (Hakanson 1978, pp. 6-9). This means helping communities solve their problems by using the educational resources of their colleges.

Reasons given for the community college's ability to act effectively and efficiently in the area of community development include: accessibility, low cost, nonexclusivity, and local control (Schonleber, March 1980, pp. 6-7). Circumstances prompting the community development focus are subject to change and incorporate market concerns of four-year institutions as well, especially the "frequent career shifts in the adult population [and] the growing number of women entering or seeking to enter the world of meaningful employment."

Summary and Conclusions

Berube (1978, p. 128) notes that Congress has moved into the educational arena when it perceived national economic needs were not being met and believes that the urban-grant idea took on the guide of the Morrill Act of 1862 (which established land-grant colleges) but lacked its substance. He points out, however, that cities do not have sufficient resources to make urban higher educational institutions effective, also state governments are attentive primarily to their own university systems. Thus, Berube reasons it is appropriate for the federal government to take an interest in and support urban universities on the scale reflected in the new Title XI of the Education Amendments of 1980.

This brief survey of present and past urban college and university relationships reveals an evolving accentuation of the public service role of American institutions of higher learning for both private and public institutions of higher education. Accommodations to the world of work in the curriculum are one sign of this new stress. Reluctance of many faculty to dilute their professional energies to engage in this new tendency has set some institutions apart from their urban context and has caused disciplinary confusion in others. But some institutions have thrived on community service as a major part of institutional mission and development. Changes in the program structure of institutions seem mandatory to serve the diverse dimensions of urban life. The extent to which departmental prerogatives intercede in the process of adapting institutions to their urban environment will undoubtedly affect the success or failure of urban programs. Thus, a coordinated effort by every part of urban institutions is essential. Title XI of the "Education Amendments of 1980" and the "Memorandum of Understanding" (1980), which was generated by several post-secondary education associations in cooperation with H.U.D., should provide the impetus for such an eventuality.

Bibliography

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *An Experiment in Planned Change: The Urban Teacher Education Planning Grant Program*. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, 1973.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *Operation Outreach: Understanding for Survival*. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, n.d. Program Case Histories.

Ashline, Nelson F., Pezzullo, Thomas R., Norris, Charles J. *Education, Inequality and National Policy*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books (D.C. Heath and Company), 1976.

Bailey, Stephen K. "Urban Decision Making: The University's Role." In *Political Backgrounds of Adult Education: The University in Urban Society*, edited by Thomas Cummings, Jr. Brookline, Mass.: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967. ED 011 364. MF - $0.98, PC - $2.96.

Beloff, Michael. *The Plateglass Universities*. Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press, 1970.

Berube, Maurice R. *The Urban University in America*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1978.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Campus and The City*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, December 1972.

Connections 1 (April 1979): entire issue. Urban College and University Network. American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Connections 1 (December 1979): entire issue. Urban College and University Network. AASCU.

Delaloye, Joan E. "Extending Continuing Education to the Elderly Homebound." *Update/Interface* (January/February 1980): 1-2.

"Education Amendments of 1980." Washington, D.C.: Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, September 24, 1979.

Elsner, Paul A. "Community Colleges Without Walls." *Interface* (April 1979): 1-2.

FYI (For Your Information). National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Circular Number 212, October 1978.

Gollattscheck, James F., Harlacher, Erwin L., Roberts, Eleanor, Wygal, Benjamin R. *College Leadership for Community Renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Grobman, Arnold B. [Remarks before a meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.] Washington, D.C.: NASULGC, November 14, 1978.

Hakanson, John W. "The Sixth Dimension." *Community and Junior College Journal* 48 (September 1978): 6-9.

Holleb, Doris B. *Colleges and the Urban Poor: The Role of Public Higher Education in Community Service*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books (D.C. Heath and Company), 1972.

Jacobson, Elden E. "Urban Curricula and the Liberal Arts Colleges." *Liberal Education* 58 (May 1972): 286-89.

Klotsche, J. Martin. *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

Kravitz, Sanford L. *Urban Institutions vs. University Clients*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, D.H.E.W., [1966].

Kerr, Clark. *The Urban-Grant University: A Model for the Future*. New York: City College of New York, 1968. ED 025 198. MF-$0.98, PC-$2.96.

"Memorandum of Understanding." Draft. Washington, D.C.: AAC, AACJC, ACE, NAICU, NASULGC, AASCU, and H.U.D., March 1980.

Meyerson, Martin, Rapkin, Chester, Collins, John E., Dahl, Leonard J. *The City and the University*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969.

Minter, W. John and Thompson, Sam M. (eds.). *Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, [1968].

Nash, George. *The University and the City: A Report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Pendelton, William C. *Urban Studies and the University – the Ford Foundation Experience*. New York: Ford Foundation, 1974. ED 097 857. MF-$0.98, PC-$2.96.

Schonleber, John. "Community Colleges and Community Development." *Community and Junior College Journal* 50 (March 1980): 4-8.

Sumner, David E. *Urban Universities and the City: Review 2*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, April 1970. ED 038 556. MF-$0.98, PC-$2.96.

Riles, Wilson C., chairman. *The Urban Education Task Force Report: Final Report of the Task Force on Urban Education to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

The Urban Grant University Act of 1977: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Fifth Congress, Second Session on HR 7328. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. ED 172 641. MF-$1.45, PC-$49.40.

To order documents in the bibliography by an ED number, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210. Documents with HE numbers are presently being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Resources in Education (RIE). In ordering, ED numbers must be specified. MF indicates microfiche and PC denotes paper copy; payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00, and all orders must be in writing.